

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 13 to 16.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action.

In this regard, a new set of claims is presented to emphasize that the present method is directed to cathodic protection of concrete. This feature was previously recited in claim 12.

New main claim 13 further recites that composition contains graphite dispersed in a curable inorganic silicate binder, the support for which is evident from page 3, lines 1 and 2 of the specification and previous claim 9.

New claim 13 also recites a dispersing agent as previously recited in claim 9 and original claim 5.

Lastly, new claim 13 recites a gelling agent which reacts with said silicate binder to cause gelation thereof in pores of said concrete. Support is evident from, for example, page 4, first full paragraph.

This amendment presents no new matter or substantial new issues and, accordingly, entry is respectfully requested.

The significance of this amendment will become further apparent from the remarks below.

Claims 9 to 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Wagner, Saunders or Gasmena.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Wagner teaches compositions for the protection of e.g. concrete against environmental influences but is not particularly concerned with cathodic protection. Therefore, carbon black and graphite are merely mentioned in column 3, line 42 as examples of various pigments since this reference is unconcerned with the conductivity of the composition.

Moreover, no mention is made of a gelling agent such as sodium aluminate or calcium hydroxide which reacts with a silicate binder to cause gelation thereof in the pores of the concrete being treated.

Accordingly, Wagner is completely unsuggestive of the present method as recited in claim 13 and is even less suggestive of the specific gelling agents, as recited in claim 14.

Saunders is concerned with conductive coatings to be applied, for example, to walls of buildings. However, no specific mention is made of impregnation of the composition into the pores of concrete, with gelation in the pores of said concrete.

Moreover, Saunders fails to teach the use of a gelling agent such as those of claim 14 for the silicate binder to cause gelation of the composition in the pores of the concrete.

Gasmaena is not specifically concerned with cathodic protection and it discloses a corrosion barrier which does not necessarily imply or suggest cathodic protection. Nor is this reference concerned with gelation in the pores of concrete to provide cathodic protection as presently recited.

For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that the rejections on prior art are untenable and should be withdrawn.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Respectfully submitted,

Franz PRUCKNER

By: Matthew M. Jacob

Matthew M. Jacob

Registration No. 25,154

Attorney for Applicant

MJ/kes
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 18, 2004